

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action of September 21, 2005. The action was non-final. Claims 1-19, 21-23 and 25-37 are pending in this case. Claims 20 and 24 were cancelled.

The Examiner withdrew the previous art rejections and entered the amendments in view of the filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE). A new grounds of rejection was issued, in response to the amendments made with the accompanying RCE.

Claims 1-19, 21-23 and 25-37 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) over Dietz (US 6,385,586). In view of the clarifying amendments, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dietz teaches a method for speech recognition, which uses text-based language conversion. The primary and only focus of Dietz is to define efficient ways of achieving accurate and speedy translations. Thus, the modification of content data is limited to language-to-language translations.

To further define the claimed invention over Dietz, the Applicant has clarified the type of alterations being performed. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to make clear that the output characteristics identify an expression to be applied to the content data. Applying an *expression* is not the same as *language translation*. For support of this amendment, the Examiner is kindly referred to the as filed-application, page 13, lines 6-11, which states:

"Primarily, the text conversion process alters the expression of the original voice data. The expression shows a character's personality or attribute (e.g., male or female or child speaker), character's circumstance or environment (e.g., in a tunnel, cave, etc.), the character's condition (e.g., excited, sad, injured, etc.). The text

conversion process can also include special effects that alter the input voice data, such as Doppler effect, echo, and so on."


The claims have also been amended to remove reference to language alterations, which in one embodiment, defined language-to-language translations. Consequently, the pending claims all now require the alteration of "expression." Dietz is silent in this regard, and for this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection be withdrawn.

If the Examiner has any comments or is available to discuss the amendments prior to issuing an action, the undersigned would kindly welcome such a call to (408) 774-6903.

In view of the foregoing, after entry of the present Amendment, the application is now in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If any other fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805. (Order No. SONYP009). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Albert Penilla, Esq.
Reg. No. 39,487

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6903
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 25920